

Second (22nd) meeting of the UNECE-FAO Team of Specialists on Monitoring Sustainable Forest Management

(Geneva, Switzerland, 21-23 October 2014)

Meeting Report

Item 1: Opening, welcome and adoption of the agenda.

The meeting was chaired by Stein Tomter, Norway (Leader of the Team).

Opening and Welcome by: Stein Tomter, Norway; Christian Friis Bach, UNECE Executive Secretary; Xiangjun Yao, Director of FAO Liaison Office Geneva; Heikki Granholm, Finland (Chair of COFFI).

The list of Participants is attached in Annex I. 35 experts from 21 countries and partner organizations took part in the Team of Specialists (ToS) meeting. The represented countries were Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Republic of Macedonia, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, USA and Uzbekistan. The representatives from COST Action FACESMAP, European Environment Agency (EEA), European State Forest Association (EUSTAFOR), Finish Forest Research Institute (METLA), United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), Wageningen University Research, ZOI Environment Network and UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section participated in the meeting.

The Agenda (Annex II) was adopted. Minutes were noted by the Secretariat.

Item 2: Presentation of the method of work and organization of the meeting

Introduction: Presentation by Stein Tomter and Roman Michalak

Item 3: Draft version of the UNFF report

Introduction: Christopher Prins presented the draft version of the study as the coordinating Lead Author. Gert-Jan Nabuurs and Andrey Filipchuk presented chapter 2.1. Guy Robertson presented chapter 2.2. Jari Parviainen presented chapter 2.3. Markku Simula presented chapter 2.4 and Christopher Prins presented chapter 3 and gave a conclusion on the development of the UNFF report.

Group work: The Team of Specialists was divided in four groups (Annex III). Each group was asked to provide the leading authors with comments on chapter 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.

After the group work on chapter 2 Christopher Prins gave an introductory presentation to chapter 3 and the audience was asked to work in the same groups on this chapter.

Outcome: Revised draft of the publication

Item 4: Forest ownership and tenure in the UNECE region

Introduction: Marek Jablonski (Poland), Brett Butler (USA), Andrius Kuliesis (Lithuania), Andrey Filipchuk (Russian Federation) and Etienne Chapelant (France) presented the forest ownership structure in their countries. After the presentations Diana Feliciano presented COST Action FACESMAP and Sebastian Glasenapp presented the new draft version of the forest ownership questionnaire and gave instructions for the group work.

Group work: The Team of Specialists was divided in three groups (Annex IV). Each group was asked to provide the team leaders (Brett Butler, Diana Feliciano and Liubov Poliakova) with comments on the forest ownership questionnaire (Annex V).

Outcome:

The experts of the ToS-meeting considered the joint project on forest ownership in the UNECE region as interesting and important. The secretariat was encouraged to continue the work on the joint forest ownership project. However the experts identified issues that need to be resolved to improve the forest ownership questionnaire and the overall reporting on this matter.

1) The participants of the meeting requested more information about the users of the data and the reason for data collection. The experts also requested information about the COST Action FACESMAP contact points as well as the procedure of reporting the results of the data collection. The question rose if the study will be repeated in the future.

2) Regarding the questionnaire the experts advised the secretariat to ensure that the requested data ties to the objectives of the study. Some questions of the quantitative part were seen as too detailed and complicate. Due to the high level of detail of some questions the experts anticipated problems during the data collection. It was recommended to use already existing data i.e. from the report on Private Forest Ownership of Europe (2007). Furthermore the experts were concerned about the reporting years and they recommended moving more questions to the qualitative part. The qualitative questions were considered to be hard to answer. It was recommended to focus on researchers. They might be more appropriate to answer these questions.

3) Regarding reporting form 1 of the questionnaire the experts requested to adjust some definitions. It was asked to add an explanatory note to the definition of Forest Available for Wood Supply (FAWS) which better explains that forest which didn't achieve maturity yet is also considered as FAWS.

The participants of the meeting highlighted that the explanatory note of the definition of "forest ownership" isn't consistent with the definition of "forest".

It was asked to provide a better definition of municipalities and examples for the definition of *Public Ownership by Municipalities*.

The experts also requested to clarify the meaning of private companies. It wasn't clear if the meaning: "private companies" comprises i.e. self-financed enterprises that are paid by the state or state enterprises competing in the market. It was recommended to develop an explanatory note to clarify this.

4) In reporting form 1 regarding forest management, the experts were asked to select one option out of two, to identify how they recommend reporting on forest management. The first working group recommended merging option 1 and option 2. Working group 2 finds option 2 more doable in the regard of data collection. Working group 3 wants to report on forest management by using option 1 and add "managed by others". It was mentioned that the time aspect that is reflected in option 2 is not an issue for the reporting.

In addition it was advised to change the wording of the definition of forest management ("cultivate" into "regenerate forest and enlarge its area") and to better define forest management in the qualitative part.

5) Regarding the definition of forest holdings in reporting form 2 the experts were concerned that the definition is too weak. Management units are often nationally defined. This might lead to difficulties and inconsistencies in reporting. Especially the definition of private holdings was seen as problematic.

Difficulties were anticipated with the data collection in table 2. The reason for the data collection wasn't clear as well as the disaggregation of the area was seen as an issue.

6) In table 3 (Reporting Form 3) it was recommended to consider adding information on the species composition of the forest (at least coniferous/broadleaves).

7) Regarding the data on certified area in table 4 (Reporting Form 4) the experts recommended to better request this data in table 3 (Reporting Form 3) which is dedicated to FAWS. The experts pointed out that the certification scheme is not only an economic indicator. For a better understanding the experts requested to specify the certification scheme in providing examples (i.e. FSC, PEFS, other).

8) The experts were concerned about the data availability and quality of Non-Wood Forest Products (NWFP) and Forest Ecosystem Services (FES) which are requested in table 4 (Reporting Form 4). It was recommended to ask for this data in the qualitative questions instead. Regarding NWFP in particular it wasn't clear what is meant by these products. It was recommended to provide examples (i.e. honey, berries and mushrooms). Furthermore it was mentioned that in some countries NWFP are not owned by the forest owners and that it is difficult to indicate who and where NWFP are harvested.

Regarding FES the experts highlighted that there is no common framework established.

9) The secretariat asked the experts for guidance on what to report in the chapter dedicated exclusively to Public Ownership. As a response the experts brought up concerns if the

disaggregation into three categories (forest ownership; public ownership and private ownership) is necessary.

10) As new reporting forms for the chapter on public ownership the experts recommended to provide information about systems of wood selling (i.e. stumpage, harvested), delivery of other goods and ecosystem services and to provide quantitative indicators (i.e. employment, expenses, education).

It was proposed to find ways to analyze the types and structures of publicly owned forests as well as benefits and objectives. Table 7c which refers to the objectives of private forest owners was seen as a good example that could be modified and then applied to public ownership.

11) Regarding the definition of rural and urban area in reporting form 7 the participants of the ToS meeting were ambiguous. One group recommended deleting the definition. A second group recommended keeping the definition but adjusting it according to existing definitions in the countries.

12) Regarding table 7c on objectives of individual forest owners, the experts proposed to move the whole table to the qualitative part of the questionnaire. Furthermore it was mentioned that the “objectives” of the individual forest owners that are prefilled in the questionnaire are rather benefits to society than real objectives.

13) In the qualitative questions, in reporting form 2.1.1, question A the experts requested to include two timeframes (1990-2000 and 2000-2014). To better explain the provided timeframes it was recommended to add an explanatory note. The explanatory note clarifies that countries should choose the appropriate timeframe in which the first changes between public and private ownership occurred.

Regarding reporting form 2.1.1, question B it was recommended to add a new category that requests information on the “introduction/establishment of new forms of public ownerships” in a country.

Regarding reporting form 2.1.1, question C it was asked to add a new category that provides information about the importance of the “consolidation of forest land” within the privately owned forest.

14) The experts agreed that a new definition for the *new forest ownership* is needed. It was asked if new forest ownership is referring to new types or institutions within the ownership categories or new forest owners as individuals that appear within the existing categories.

Item 5: Plenary: Conclusions and further actions; other matters

No other matters

Item 6: Plenary: Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed by thanking the participants of the meeting for their valuable input; the excellent work of the co-chairs and moderators of the working groups.